

REMARKS

Claims 1–35 are pending in the application. Claims 1-8 and 13-21 are rejected in the present Office Action. Claims 23-35 have been withdrawn from consideration in response to a Restriction Requirement. Claim 21 has been cancelled in this Response. Claims 3 and 15-17 have been amended to correct minor typographical errors. No new matter has been added.

Amendments to the Specification

The specification has been amended to include the Serial Number and filing date of the application incorporated by reference. No new matter has been added.

Claim Objections

Claim 7 is objected to for a minor informality and has been amended to correct the informality.

Claims 9-12 and 22 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim; however, Examiner has indicated that these claims would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Accordingly, claims 9-12 and 22 have been rewritten in independent form and, therefore, are believed to be allowable.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,831,893 issued to Ben Nun (hereinafter “Ben Nun”). Applicants respectfully traverse Examiner’s rejection of claim 14 as being anticipated by Ben Nun. In particular, independent claim 14 recites one or more processing blades in communication with “a processor blade port having a function associated with a predetermined classification.” Ben Nun does not disclose a processing blade having the features disclosed in Applicants’ specification and recited in claim 14. In particular, referring to pages 18-20 of the specification, Applicants describe numerous features relating to the processor blades implemented in various embodiments of the present invention. For example, Applicants describe processor blades that are operable to provide specialized functions such as encryption or audio mixing that is implemented in specialized

engines supported by the processor blades. The processor blade recited in claim 14 is not anticipated by the packet processors PP1-PPN disclosed in Ben Nun and applied by Examiner as a basis for the rejection. For this reason, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claim 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) should be removed.

Claims 19-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,104,700 issued to Haddock (hereinafter "Haddock"). Claim 19 has been amended to recite the use of a dataflow program to program the classification rules and functions through the control path that looks across packet flows of the data path. This feature is not disclosed in Haddock, nor the other references cited by Examiner. For the reasons discussed above, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of claims 19-20 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Haddock should be removed.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 2, 7 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Haddock in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,262,983 issued to Yoshizawa (hereinafter "Yoshizawa"). Claims 4-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Haddock in view of Yoshizawa as applied to claim 1, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,172,990 issued to Deb (hereinafter "Deb"). Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Haddock in view of Yoshizawa as applied to claim 1, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,628,617 issued to Karol (hereinafter "Karol"). Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Haddock in view of Ben Nun in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,418,125 issued to Oran (hereinafter "Oran"). Claims 16-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ben Nun in view of Deb. Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Haddock in view of Ben Nun in view of Publication No. 20020107908A1 to Dharanikota (hereinafter "Dharanikota").

Independent claim 1 recites a modify/process engine that is interfaced with a classify engine, wherein the modified process engine has plural ports, with each port having an associated function. In the rejection of independent claim 1, Examiner states that Haddock discloses a "modify/process engine (see Figure 1b, a combined system of QoS queues 180 and Dequeue 162)." Examiner further states that each port has an associated function referring to

column 4, lines 60-67 and column 6, lines 1-15. Applicants respectfully disagree with Examiner's characterization of the cited portions of Haddock as meeting the limitation recited in independent claim 1. In particular, the cited portions of Haddock do not disclose a modify/process engine. The QoS 180 disclosed in Haddock, at best, are more analogous to the shaper engine 18 disclosed in Applicants' specification, which controls transmission of the packets to the network, but does not process the packets according to an associated function so that packets flow through the process as a data path. For the reasons discussed above, Haddock fails to disclose the features recited in independent claim 1. The rejection of independent claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) should, therefore, be removed.

Each of the dependent claims 2-8, 13, 15-18 and 20 rejected by Examiner under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) are allowable as being dependent on an independent base claim. None of the proposed combinations of references cited above by Examiner supply the limitations that are missing from the references applied to the respective independent base claims for the reasons discussed hereinabove. It is respectfully submitted, therefore, that the rejection of claims 2-8, 13, 15-18 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) should be removed.

CONCLUSION

In view of the remarks set forth herein, the application is believed to be in condition for allowance and a notice to that effect is solicited. Nonetheless, should any issues remain that might be subject to resolution through a telephonic interview, the examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as First Class Mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on October 26, 2005.



Attorney for Applicant(s)

Respectfully submitted,



Gary W. Hamilton
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 31,834